



Citation	<p>Michaël Casaer, Lies Langouche (2014)</p> <p>Timing of Parenteral Nutrition Support - The authors reply</p> <p>Crit Care Med. 2014 May;42(5):e385-6.</p>
Archived version	<p>Author manuscript: the content is identical to the content of the published paper, but without the final typesetting by the publisher</p>
Published version	<p>http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000000256</p>
Journal homepage	<p>http://www.lww.com/ccmjournal/Pages/default.aspx</p>
Author contact	<p>lies.langouche@med.kuleuven.be</p> <p>Klik hier als u tekst wilt invoeren.</p>
IR	<p>https://lirias.kuleuven.be/handle/123456789/452383</p>

(article begins on next page)



The authors reply

Michael P Casaer, MD, PhD^{1,2} and Lies Langouche, PhD²

¹Department of Intensive Care Medicine, University Hospitals Leuven, Leuven, Belgium;

²Laboratory of Intensive Care Medicine, Division of Cellular and Molecular Medicine, KU
Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

We thank Dr. Bristrian for kindly appreciating our assessment of body composition changes during critical illness through quantitative CT (qCT). This EPaNIC substudy, indeed, does not answer the clinical question when to start artificial feeding. This question has been addressed by 3 different high-quality RCT's including 6317 patients, unanimously showing no immediate vital or delayed functional benefit with parenteral nutrition initiated before day 7 (Early-PN) in the ICU (1-3). The largest RCT even demonstrated net harm by early-PN (1). Enhanced enteral nutrition during the first week in ICU, likewise, failed to provoke clinical benefit (4).

The aim of the EPaNIC qCT sub-study was to generate insight in the mechanisms of Early-PN's failure. Early-PN provoked a muscle composition shift towards water or fat and it increased the volume of intramuscular adipose tissue. Therefore, as suggested by Dr. Bristrian, lipogenesis is more likely the underlying mechanism than water retention. Secondly, Early-PN failed to prevent muscle wasting, both Early and Late-PN patients lost on average 7% of their initial muscle volume during the first week in ICU. Dr. Bristrian suggests that this failure is partly due to the small difference in protein intake between the two patient groups. As he rightly estimated, supplementation of insufficient enteral nutrition with commercial all-in-one PN preparations resulted, after one week, in on average 270 g of

additional protein administered to Early-PN patients. The cumulative protein intake did not correlate with muscle volume losses ($r^2=0.004$ and $p=0.82$). Furthermore, 63% of the administered nitrogen with Early-PN in EPaNIC was eliminated via the urine (5). In addition, as The_Nephro-Protective_Trial-authors recently reported at ESPEN 2013, increased protein intake up to the recommended 2 gram/kilogram/day provoked no clinical benefit and increased need for renal replacement therapy in the first adequately powered RCT studying different protein doses in critical illness. [<https://www.anzctr.org.au/Trial/Registration/TrialReview.aspx?ACTRN=12609001015235>].

The hypothetical potential for improved tissue repair and immunological response with enhanced protein intake early in critical illness is refuted by clinical results. First, Early-PN provoked increased incidence and delayed recovery of ICU acquired muscle weakness, studied in 600 awake EPaNIC patients (6). Furthermore, microscopically, quadriceps muscle biopsy analysis indicated that the muscle weakness was not explained by muscle fiber size, but by suppressed autophagy. Autophagy, a catabolic cellular household mechanism crucial for clearing of cellular damage and mal-functioning organelles was clearly enhanced by Late-PN (6).

Secondly, none of the RCT's mentioned earlier (1-4) showed reduced incidence of new infections with enhanced feeding in the first week of critical illness. Even more, in EPaNIC, Early-PN provoked a dramatic increase in wound infections, air way infections and septicemia (1). Whether this should be attributed to glucose rather than protein, lipids or total energy dose remains speculative. Nevertheless, administered macronutrient doses and obtained blood concentrations are more likely to be important than the osmolarity in the IV-bag prior to infusion.

In conclusion, the results of recent clinical, body composition and cell metabolism investigations all consistently question the paradigm of improving outcome in ICU through attenuation of early catabolism.

References:

1. Casaer MP, Mesotten D, Hermans G, et al. Early versus late parenteral nutrition in critically ill adults. *N Engl J Med* 2011; 365:506-517
2. Heidegger CP, Berger MM, Graf S, et al. Optimisation of energy provision with supplemental parenteral nutrition in critically ill patients: a randomised controlled clinical trial. *Lancet* 2013; 381:385-393
3. Doig GS, Simpson F, Sweetman EA, et al. Early parenteral nutrition in critically ill patients with short-term relative contraindications to early enteral nutrition: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2013; 309:2130-2138
4. Rice, TW, Wheeler, AP, Thompson, BT, et al. Initial trophic vs full enteral feeding in patients with acute lung injury: the EDEN randomized trial. *JAMA* 307:795-803, 2012
5. Gunst J, Vanhorebeek I, Casaer MP, et al. Impact of early parenteral nutrition on metabolism and kidney injury. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2013; 24(6):995-1005
6. Hermans G, Casaer MP, Clerckx B et al. Effect of tolerating macronutrient deficit on the development of intensive-care unit acquired weakness: a subanalysis of the EPaNIC trial. *Lancet Resp Med* 2013; 1:621-629